

DRAFT

25X1A9a  
[REDACTED]

12 November 1959

TO: All Recipients

I would greatly appreciate your comments.

I suggest:

1. That a senior planning and review board be established in ERA, directly subordinate to Chief, ERA; the panel to consist of the Division Chiefs in ERA.

- a. Every member of the board would be responsible for reviewing before publication all the major products (including contributions to NIE's, IP's and area wide projects, but excluding NIS's, CSM's and contributions to OCI publications) of all branches in ERA. The board would receive products directly from the branches and would submit them with their group recommendations to Chief, ERA. The board would not itself prepare coordinated reports from contributions, but at an early stage would discuss with the responsible branch the preparations of coordinated reports. The board would review the coordinated report before transmitting it to Chief, ERA.
- b. The board would consult with ONE concerning the terms of reference for NIE's. The board would have the responsibility for preparing the outline for the ERA contributions to NIE's, and the terms of reference for all branches, calling on any analysts or branches whom they need for assistance.
- c. Each Division chief would continue to be responsible for those products of his division not reviewed by the panel as a whole. This would include NIS's, which in most cases would be reviewed by the Deputy Division Chief.

2. That the board customarily call on the analyst-authors of papers to defend their products in an oral review. The analysts would be supported in their defense by their branch chiefs, but the primary responsibility for defense should rest upon the analyst. The panel would have the authority to call on any analyst whom they judge could

C-O-E-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

contribute to a substantive evaluation of any product.

3. That the same panel develop an ERA research program in broad terms, establish guide posts for the branches and review the research programs submitted by the branches.

4. That the same panel act as the ERA promotion panel, receiving promotion actions from the branches and making recommendations.

5. Since the adoption of these proposals would impose heavy burdens on the Division Chiefs, it would be necessary to relieve them of some of their present responsibilities. I recommend that this be done by a combination of a by-passing of the Divisions on some administrative details (such routine matters as time, attendance, leaves), and a transfer of complete responsibility for some other matters to the Deputy Division Chiefs (and the Administrative Assistants).

6. I recommend that these changes be approached experimentally, by first initiating them for the preparation of the next Soviet and Chinese NIE's.

#### Present Method

1. Generally, the Division Chiefs now review only the products of these branches directly under them.

2. In most cases an individual analyst, or a branch, is responsible for the coordination of papers. The effective responsibility for choosing and rejecting what is contributed by other branches often rests upon an individual analyst.

3. D/A negotiates with ONE on the terms of reference for NIE's, and prepares the terms of reference for the contributing branches.

4. There is now established an ORR promotion panel. It includes some of the people who would be on the proposed senior review panel.

#### Advantages

1. The advantages of the procedures here proposed are that they would improve ERA's research product, eliminate duplication of effort, and raise the morale of ERA personnel.

a. They would improve ERA's research product because they would:

1.) Improve communication between the individuals and groups within ERA, and provide a means for effectively coordinating their efforts. It would in effect reduce

DRAFT

analysts would (supported by their branch chiefs) talk directly to all the division chiefs, who would be acting as direct substantive representatives of Chief, ERA (in some cases Chief, Economic Research Area would undoubtedly sit on the panel).

- 2) Provide a high level, competent group, familiar with all the products and all the resources of ERA. This group would be in a position to effectively direct all the resources of ERA toward the achievement of our goals. Because of its contact with all ERA personnel the group would be in a position to call on individuals in the establishment or modification of goals. The panel would consider not only whether or not our products were correct, but also, whether they are worth while.
  - 3) Provide a group which could communicate effectively with the ONR panel of consultants. By their knowledge of the contribution to papers, the senior review panel would be in a position to debate the published versions.
- b. It would improve the morale of ERA personnel because it would:
- 1) Provide the analysts with a high level group - ready to debate with them the controversial aspects of their products. This would increase the analysts' sense of responsibility for their work, and their feeling of worth while accomplishment.
  - 2) Provide a high-level group, which, having read the substantive product of all analysts and discussed the products with the analysts, would be in a position to evaluate personnel capabilities and make judgements on promotions.

#### Discussion

The above proposal is derived from my own experience, and from my discussions with various persons in ERA. The suggestion is primarily aimed at improving communication and coordination within the ERA, and between ERA and other organizations. It is my belief that the decisions as to what problems should be attacked with ERA's resources, and how the total product of ERA analysts should be combined and

DRAFT

condensed into finished products are so important that they are best entrusted to a high level group. However, no group will be in a position to make these decisions unless the members of the group are thoroughly familiar with all the resources and products of ERA

There is an obvious danger that any multi-person review board could become a major bottle-neck in an intelligence production process. This is of course not my intention, and I do not believe that my suggestion would necessarily lead to such a situation. I have not specified the internal organization of the panel. However, organized internally, I believe a major consideration should be to give the chairman sufficient authority to insure that the panel would not become a bottle-neck. In this connection it should be emphasized that I am not proposing an additional level of review to those now existing. I believe an additional level of review would be most unwise. Therefore, it is essential to the working of my suggestion that all division chiefs receive all contributions at the same time, i.e., that the chief of the producing division not receive contributions from his division and review them before the other panel members receive them. I think it essential that one division chief not be in the position of defending the products of his division before the other division chiefs. Every effort must be made to insure that the panel decisions be as objective as possible, but a process whereby each division chief would present and defend the products of his division, as his responsibility, could conceivably interfere with an objective evaluation.

*who?*

*Dis Ap  
insure for  
his division?*

Since my suggestion involves relieving the division chiefs of many of their current responsibilities for their divisions (in order to allow them sufficient time to attend to the proposed new duties), and also relieves the division chiefs of individual responsibility for those products of their divisions which are to be reviewed by the board, it is obvious that I am suggesting that to some extent they cease to be division chiefs.

If all administrative functions were handled by the branches directly with St/A and other staffs, and if all substantive products went directly from the branches to the review panel (or to another review panel directly under Chief, ERA - as might be done for NIS's), then there would be no need for the present division organizations.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

DRAFT

Although I envision this as probably a logical development, I do not propose a revolutionary elimination of the present division organizations. I propose rather an experimental or evolutionary approach to the possible "withering away" of the divisions.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L